

APPENDIX A

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY

PAUMA CASINO PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS CHECKLIST

PLEASE NOTE: This checklist was provided as part of the Draft TEIR that was circulated for public review from August 8, 2007 through September 21, 2007. It does not reflect the assessments set forth in this Final EA/TEIR with project modifications and updated reports on traffic, water, and fire and emergency services.

I. Aesthetics

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcrops, historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of historic buildings or views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project would result in an impact to scenic vistas from Adams Drive, Cole Grade Road, and along SR-76, but these impacts would be less than significant due to the distance involved and the limited area of impact in relation to the scale of the view of the mountains. The proposed hotel tower would be visible during the day and also visible at night as the casino, hotel, and parking structures would be illuminated. The existing Casino Pauma is also illuminated at night, but is much smaller in scale. Mitigation measures have been proposed and incorporated into the project design to ensure that light impacts remain less than significant. See Section 4.1 of the Environmental Evaluation, Aesthetics, for additional information.

II. Agricultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Involve changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) The Proposed Project would result in the loss of 28.5 acres of citrus groves on the Pauma Reservation. This land is mapped as Unique Farmland on the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, map of San Diego County. This land is used for production of the state's major crops on soils not qualifying for prime or statewide importance. This land is irrigated. While there would be a conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use, this conversion would be consistent with the land use plan for the Pauma Reservation and would not preclude the continued farming of the surrounding lands. See Section 4.2 of the Environmental Evaluation, Agricultural Resources, for additional information.

III. Air Quality

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would result in impacts to air quality related to the operation of diesel construction equipment and the dust caused by grading. Grading is anticipated to take approximately 3 months and the construction of the casino an additional 15 months. Air quality impacts generated subsequent to the opening of the casino would be primarily related to exhaust from kitchen areas and exhaust from traffic generated by employee and customer trips. These impacts have been determined to be less than significant. See Section 4.3 of the Environmental Evaluation, Air Quality, for additional information.

IV. Biological Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any off-Reservation riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would result in impacts to approximately 66 acres, most of which are developed with the existing Casino Pauma or are actively farmed citrus groves. See Section 4.4 of the Environmental Evaluation, Biological Resources, for additional information.

V. Cultural Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archeological resource?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐
☐
☐


A record search and site survey has determined that there are no cultural resources within the area that will be impacted by the Proposed Project. See Section 4.5 of the Environmental Evaluation, Cultural Resources, for additional information.

VI. Geology and Soils

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 41	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) The project site is not located within a mapped Earthquake Fault Zone (ICBO, 1988). In addition, the site survey did not identify any evidence of on-site faulting. The project site is, however, like the rest of Southern California, within a seismically active area. Faulting in the project area occurs in several locations, with the Elsinore Fault at the base of Palomar Mountain, north of the project site, being the known major fault. The Elsinore Fault comes within approximately 2,000 feet of the project site. A Magnitude 6.0 earthquake is believed to have occurred approximately 30 miles northwest of the project site, in Lake Elsinore, on May 15, 1910. No other large earthquakes have been recorded along the Elsinore Fault, although many much smaller earthquakes have. The proposed buildings would be constructed to Uniform Building Codes appropriate for seismically active southern California.

- b Construction activities relating to the Proposed Project will conform to federal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit standards and will therefore not result in substantial erosion. See also Section 4.8 of the Environmental Evaluation, Hydrology/Water Quality.

VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a – c The Proposed Project would not involve the transport, use or storage of hazardous materials. There are no reasonably foreseeable conditions that would involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials and it is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. See Section 4.7 of the Environmental Evaluation, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for additional information.
- d. The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures to the significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The threat of wildland fires in the project area, especially on the steep slopes of Palomar Mountain, will require mitigation measures such as fire sprinklers, fire hydrants, and emergency vehicle access to protect persons, vehicles and structures in the event of a wildland fire. See Section 4.13 of the Environmental Evaluation, Public Services, for a discussion of fire protection.

VIII. Hydrology/Water Quality

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there should be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream, or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

See Section 4.8 of the Environmental Evaluation, Hydrology/Water Quality, for additional information.

IX. Land Use

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan covering lands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The project site is located on tribal trust land away from land uses. No conflict with land uses are anticipated. The Pala-Pauma Subarea Plan of the County of San Diego General Plan identifies the Pauma Valley as having a rural quality characterized by agriculture, low-density development, and natural open space. See Section 4.9 of the Environmental Evaluation, Land Use, for additional information.
- b. The project would not involve modification of any habitat included within a conservation plan. See Section 4.4 of the Environmental Evaluation, Biological Resources, for additional information regarding natural communities conservation planning efforts.

X. Mineral Resources

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a – b Implementation of the Proposed Project would not affect the availability of any known mineral resources and no impact would occur. See Section 4.10 of the Environmental Evaluation, Mineral Resources, for additional information.

XI. Noise

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would result in short term noise impacts associated with grading and casino construction. Long term noise impacts would be mostly limited to traffic generated by the proposed casino. Residential properties to the north and northwest of the project site, both on and off the Pauma Reservation, are likely to be able to hear construction equipment on the project site as well as vehicles on the access road. The sound levels will be dependant upon meteorological conditions, such as the direction and strength of the prevailing winds. With the incorporation of mitigation measures limiting the hours of truck traffic and heavy construction, the noise levels are not calculated to exceed significance criteria utilized by the County of San Diego. See Section 4.11 of the Environmental Evaluation, Noise, for additional information.

XII. Population and Housing

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a – b. The Proposed Project would not induce population growth or displace existing housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing. Additional housing is anticipated to be constructed on the Reservation as funds become available to improve the quality of the residential structures on the Reservation. This is considered to be a positive impact by the Tribe. The construction of new Tribal housing is not directly linked to the proposed casino project. Please see Section 4.12 of the Environmental Evaluation, Population and Housing, for additional information.

XIII. Public Services

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a The Proposed Project would not create the need for new or physically altered schools or parks or other public services. The Tribe would, however, need to increase the levels of service on the Reservation to include the casino site. Solid waste would be transported by Waste Management Services. Police and fire protection will be provided by the Tribe, although the Tribe may contract with others for these services. The Tribe will coordinate with the desired service providers for electricity, gas, and telecommunications and other necessary public services for the casino. See Section 4.13 of the Environmental Evaluation, Public Services, for more information.

XIV. Recreation

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a The Proposed Project would not measurably increase the use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. The casino will provide an new recreational venue for Tribal members and residents of the project area. See Section 4.14 of the Environmental Evaluation, Recreation, for additional information.

XV. Transportation/Traffic

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access for responders?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Proposed Project would generate approximately 4,512 trips per day on SR-76. Not all of this would be new traffic, as the casino hope to attract business from a number of trips that already pass by the casino site on a daily basis. Even if all trips to the casino were in addition to the traffic that already occurs on SR-76, it has been determined that the impact would not be significant. See Section 4.15 of the Environmental Evaluation, Traffic/Circulation, for additional information.

XVI. Utilities and Service Systems

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)	Result in a determination by a wastewater treatment provider (if applicable), which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

All utilities are currently available at the existing Casino Pauma. The existing package wastewater treatment plant, which was constructed several years ago for the Casino Pauma, will be expanded to meet the demand of the Proposed Project. The existing Pauma Reservation water system will also be expanded to meet increased water demands, including fire flow, with the construction of three new potable wells. Existing detention basins for storm water will be expanded to handle the increased area of development. See Section 4.16 of the Environmental Evaluation, Utilities and Service Systems, for additional information.

XVII. Cumulative Effects

Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, or probable future projects.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

A review of project files at the County of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use identified 15 projects in the project vicinity that are likely to contribute to substantial impacts to the environment. Many of these projects would contribute to cumulative traffic impacts on SR-76. These cumulative traffic impacts are currently being addressed by the Reservation Transportation Authority (RTA) SR-76 Corridor Study. See Section 5.0 of the Environmental Evaluation, Cumulative Effects, for additional information.